

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
FLORENCE DIVISION

Curtis Q. Owens, #184674,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	Civil Action No.: 0:09-0192-TLW-PJG
)	
Henery [sic] McMasters, Atty Gen, <u>et. al.</u> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

ORDER

Plaintiff, Curtis Q. Owens (“plaintiff”), brought this civil action, *pro se*, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. (Doc. #1). The plaintiff filed a motion for preliminary injunction on January 26, 2009. (Doc. #6).

This matter now comes before this Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed by United States Magistrate Judge Paige Jones Gossett to whom this case is assigned. (Doc. #13). In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that the District Court dismiss the four correctional facilities named in the complaint (Kershaw Correctional Institution, Allendale Correctional Institution, Perry Correctional Institution, and Tyger River Correctional Institution), and that the District Court deny the plaintiff’s motion for preliminary injunction. (Doc. #13). The plaintiff filed objections to the report. (Doc. #17). In conducting this review, the Court applies the following standard:

The magistrate judge makes only a recommendation to the Court, to which any party may file written objections...The Court is not bound by the recommendation of the magistrate judge but, instead, retains responsibility for the final determination. The Court is required to make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specified findings or recommendation as to which an objection is made. However, the Court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, the factual

or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which no objections are addressed. While the level of scrutiny entailed by the Court's review of the Report thus depends on whether or not objections have been filed, in either case, the Court is free, after review, to accept, reject, or modify any of the magistrate judge's findings or recommendations.

Wallace v. Housing Auth. of the City of Columbia, 791 F. Supp. 137, 138 (D.S.C. 1992)

(citations omitted).

In light of the standard set forth in Wallace, the Court has reviewed, de novo, the Report and the objections. After careful review of the Report and objections thereto, the Court **ACCEPTS** the Report. (Doc. #13).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Terry L. Wooten
United States District Judge

June 8, 2009
Florence, South Carolina